

I stand opposed to the ongoing process of deregulation of broadcast ownership laws. The consequences of the 1996 Telecommunications Act on radio as a whole is discouraging. The FCC protects and licenses frequencies using taxpayer money. If the FCC may then turn around and license unlimited frequencies to one company, why must we then spend taxpayer dollars protecting this monopoly? If radio is no longer competitive, no longer has an incentive to serve the public, than why does the government regulate the airwaves at all? Radio needs to remain a service to the public. Clear channel may become an exclusive monopoly. At that point, the government is merely spending money to protect a monopoly which no longer has any economic incentive to tailor it's operations to the desires of the people. At this point, what purpose will the FCC have in licensing frequencies at all? It will serve no legitimate useful purpose if one company owns all of radio. Clear Channel only makes money because it has been allowed to exclusively use certain public airwaves. That is a privilege that we the people allow, not a right. If the interests of the public can be thrown by the wayside, so should the protection that the fcc provides. Tossing out ownership caps is contrary to the ultimate purpose of having government protect and license frequencies. If one company can own them all, then they need to spend money to protect themselves - without help or exclusive licensing. We should allow as many broadcasters as desire to compete in one frequency and drown one another out - that is the only TRUE form of unregulated radio.